

RCRA Corrective Action Environmental Indicator Forms Addendum

Completed by: *Frank Dellechaie, Ray Saracino*

Date: *October 19, 2000*

Document edit: *Eve Levin 7/3/02*

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|---|
| | | "X" all that apply: | |
| Facility Name: <i>Reliance Technical Services</i> <i>a.k.a. Pilkington Barnes-Hind</i> Street Address: <i>895 Kifer Road</i> City, State: <i>Sunnyvale, CA 94086</i> EPA ID#: <i>CAD 001 938 828</i> | | NPL Site? | |
| | | BRAC Site? | |
| | | GPRA Baseline? | X |
| | | EJ Site? | |
| | | Near-bankrupt? | |
| Facility Contact Name: <i>Philip Pogledich</i> Company: <i>Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro</i> Street Address: <i>PO Box 7880</i> City, State: <i>San Francisco, CA 94120-7880</i> Phone: <i>(415) 983-1240</i> E-mail: <i>pogledich_pj@pillsburylaw.com</i> | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Agencies Involved in Remedial Oversight (Mark an "x" at the left of the boxes that apply:) | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | DTSC Site Mitigation - Region __ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Federal CERCLA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | RWQCB - Region <u>2</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | DTSC Permit Unit - Region __ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Federal RCRA | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (specify) |

| |
|--|
| Project Manager Interviewed: <i>Keith Roberson</i> |
| Agency: <i>RWQCB Region 2 - Oakland</i> |
| Phone: <i>(510) 622-2404</i> |
| email: <i>ker@rb2.swrcb.ca.gov</i> |

Site Summary:

Barnes Hind has owned this site since 1955 and operated an ophthalmic products research and manufacturing facility from 1955 to 1989. In 1993 the name changed to Pilkington Barnes Hind. Pilkington Barnes Hind is the potentially responsible (PRP) party for the releases at this site although the current occupant of the facility is Reliance Technical Services. Keith Roberson is the RWQCB project manager.

RWQCB has issued an order compelling investigation and cleanup. An RI (remedial investigation) was conducted for both soil and ground water. Concentrations of TCE detected in soils were below levels of concern, hence remedial measures for soils have not been required. Recently, PCE was detected on the eastern side of the on-site building during an environmental assessment. This was subsequently confirmed by investigations which were performed by Mohawk Laboratories (another facility with environmental releases). The extent of this PCE contamination has not been characterized.

This facility is one contributor to a larger, multi-facility regional ground water contamination plume. During the previous analogous review in 1997, the facility was operating one on-site extraction well while the complexities of a multi-facility groundwater plume were being addressed. As of 1998, this extraction well has been shut-off. Legal counsel for the facility is currently claiming that contamination is not originating from the facility and has petitioned the Regional Board to rescind their Cleanup and Abatement Order. The RWQCB has already rejected this claim and is convinced that releases of VOCs have occurred from the Pilkington Barnes Hind site. Pilkington Barnes Hind is appealing this decision to the State Water Board.

CA 725 Current Human Exposures Under Control

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Current Human Exposures Under Control Determination ("x" appropriate box) | | If determination is NO or IN , the likelihood of achieving Els by 2005 is ("x" appropriate box): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | YES | <input type="checkbox"/> | Likely by _____ (insert year) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | NO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Unlikely |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | IN (Insufficient information) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Difficult to determine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No determination was made | | |
| If determination is YES , it falls under the following categories: ("x" all that apply) | | If determination is NO or IN , it falls under the following categories: ("x" all that apply) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Final stages of C/A | <input type="checkbox"/> | Early stages of C/A |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Stabilization measures implemented | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Indoor air issues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | No groundwater contamination | <input type="checkbox"/> | Abandoned, near-bankrupt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Undergoing redevelopment | <input type="checkbox"/> | Technical limitations Please specify (complex hydrogeology, contaminants, large area): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Uncooperative |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Administrative delays |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other: |

For sites with **NO or IN** determinations, provide a description of the next steps which will be taken to achieve the Current Human Exposures EI:

The review team is concerned that this site is unlikely to satisfy the GPRA goals by 2005. Legal counsel for the facility is claiming that contamination is not originating from the facility and has petitioned the State Board to rescind their Cleanup and Abatement Order. The review team recommends that the facility demonstrate that indoor air is not adversely impacted. The review team recommends that the facility adopt institutional controls for exposures to construction workers or demonstrate that such controls are unnecessary.

CA750 Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control ("x" appropriate box) | | If determination is NO or IN , the likelihood of achieving Els by 2005 is ("x" appropriate box): | |
| | YES | | Likely by ____ (insert year) |
| X | NO | X | Unlikely |
| | IN (Insufficient information) | | Difficult to determine |
| | No determination was made | | |
| If determination is YES , it falls under the following categories ("x" all that apply): | | If determination is NO or IN , it falls under the following categories ("x" all that apply): | |
| | Final stages of C/A | | Early stages of C/A |
| | Stabilization measures implemented | | GW/SW issues |
| | No groundwater contamination | | Abandoned, near-bankrupt |
| | Undergoing redevelopment | | Technical limitations, Please specify (complex hydrogeology, contaminants, large area): |
| | Other: | | Uncooperative |
| | | | Administrative delays |
| | | X | Other: co-mingled plume |

For sites with **NO or IN** determinations, provide a description of the next steps which will be taken to achieve the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI:

The review team is concerned that this site is unlikely to satisfy the GPRA goals by 2005. Legal counsel for the facility is claiming that contamination is not originating from the facility and has petitioned the State Board to rescind their Cleanup and Abatement Order. The review team recommends that the facility characterize the full nature and extent of their releases to groundwater including, at a minimum, the lateral and vertical extent of TCE and PCE both on and off-site. The review team recommends that the facility stabilize the migration of contaminated groundwater.